



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,735	03/09/2004	Marcelo Gomes Oliveira	2003P18623US	1746
7590 02/20/2008				
Siemens Corporation Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator Intellectual Property Department 170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830			EXAMINER KING, JAMAL J	
			ART UNIT 4141	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/20/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/796,735

Applicant(s)

OLIVEIRA ET AL.

Examiner

JAMAL J. KING

Art Unit

4141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/09/2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/09/2004, 09/02/2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-31 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed on September 2, 2005 is not considered because

BA - has listed Patent Publication No. 2004/186904 with date 9/23/2004, and has Patent Publication No. 2005/021619 in the IDS.

The U.S. Patent documents, BA, BB and BC in the information disclosure statement are missing. A legible copy of each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed must be submitted.

Drawings

3. In the specification on page 15, line 3 recites the element D, which is not shown in figure 3.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. In the specification on page 13, line 16 recites that element 222 as net traffic filter, page 12 lines 24 recites that element 222 as channel filter and page 13 line 11 recites that element 224 as net traffic filter. In the specification on page 18, lines 7 and 8 recites, “the MP 102 transmits a net traffic result as outgoing voice conference traffic 414...”, while lines 8 and 9 recite “the MP 102 transmits a net traffic result as outgoing voice conference 416...”

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3, 5, 14, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph because the claims recite the limitation “n” and there is no specific definition or description of the intended meaning.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1, 6, 9, 11, 15, 17, 22, 25, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Whynot US Patent Publication No. 2004/0267882).

As per claim 1, Whynot discloses:

A media processor for a voice conferencing system, the media processor comprising: (page 1 [0007] lines 52-55); where “communication session” is “voice conference system” as claimed

-a network interface that receives incoming voice conference

traffic (page 2 [0025] lines 53-54); where “network facilitates communication between components of the system” is “network interface that receives voice conference traffic” as claimed.

-processor that directs a selected portion of the incoming voice

conference traffic through the network interface to a network distribution

address (page 1 [0007] lines 56-61); where “communication session” is “voice conference traffic” as claimed.

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Whynot discloses:

-the processor breaks the selected portion into packets prior to transmission

through the network interface (page 10 [0105] lines 64-65 “The MAS identifies the packet interval to be used during the communication session”), the MAS identifying a packet interval used during the communication session shows that processor breaking the selected portion into packets prior to transmission through the network interface.

As per claim 9, Whynot discloses:

A voice conferencing system comprising (page 3 [0034] line 15); where “communication system” is “voice conference system” as claimed.

-a group of media processors assigned to concurrently support a voice conference (page 4 [0041] lines 41-44); where “conference call” is “voice conference” as claimed.

-distribution circuitry coupled to the group of media processors, the distribution circuitry operable to communicate selected data received from a first media processor in the group to remaining media processors in the group (page 4 [0041] lines 44-51); where “ports” is “distribution circuitry” as claimed.

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and further Whynot discloses:

-the distribution circuitry communicates the selected data to a network distribution address (page1, [0007], lines 60-66, “The apparatus also includes a controller operable to transfer the communication session from one of the processors associated with a first portion of the communication session to another of the processors..... The controller associates a distinct network address with each of the communication session portions), the controller transferring the communication session from one processor to another, and associating a distinct network address with each communication session portion shows that distribution circuitry communicates the selected data to a network distribution address.

As per claim 15, rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and further Whynot discloses:

-the first media processor is operable to receive a selected transmission of voice

conference traffic originating from at least one other media processor in the group

(page 1, [0007], lines 59-63, “The apparatus also includes a controller operable to transfer the communication session from one of the processors associated with a first portion of the communication session to another of the processors associated with a second portion of the communication session.”), transferring the communication session from one processor to another shows that the first media processor is operable to receive a selected transmission voice conference traffic originating from at least one other media processor in the group.

As per claim 17, Whynot discloses:

A method for exchanging voice conference data, the method comprising (page 4 [0041] lines 41-44 and page 4 [0045] lines 44-48):

-receiving incoming voice conference traffic at a first media processor (page 4 [0041]

lines 44-48); where “audio information” is “voice conference traffic” as claimed

-transmitting a selected portion of the incoming voice conference traffic to a network distribution address (page 4 [0041] lines 53-58).

As per claim 22, Whynot discloses:

-A method for conducting a voice conference comprising (Abstract, lines 4-6); where

“The apparatus, method and computer program transfer the communication session from one of the processors to another of the processors....” is a method for conducting a voice conference as claimed

-receiving first endpoint traffic at a first media processor (page 4 [0041] lines 44-46).

-transmitting from the first media processor a selected portion of the first endpoint traffic (page 4 [0041] lines 47-48).

-receiving second endpoint traffic at a second media processor (page 4 [0041] lines 44-46).

-distributing the selected portion to the second media processor (page 4 [0041] lines 47-48).

- receiving the selected portion at the second media processor (page 4 [0041] lines 44-46).

Claim 25 recites similar limitation as claim 22 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 22. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to perform the stated limitation from a second media processor in order to have a stable voice conference.

Claim 27 recites similar limitation as claim 1 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1. The use of machine readable medium does not change the analysis of the limitation.

Claim 30 recites similar limitation as claim 22 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 22. The use of machine readable medium does not change the analysis of the limitation

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 4141

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4, 5, 8, 13, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 29 and 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whynot (US Patent Publication No. 2004/0267882), and further in view of Biage (US Publication No. 2004/0190701).

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Whynot does not disclose:

-the network interface listens on an assigned network address to receive a selected transmission of voice conference traffic from a second media processor. However, Biage in analogous art discloses that the network interface listens on an assigned network address to receive a selected transmission of voice conference traffic from a second media processor (Biage, page 3, [0028], lines 56-58, “the line interface 322 receives, from the terminal device, the participant voice signal, for example A.....”) and (Biage, page 3, [0029], lines 65-66, “The bus interlace 324 provides for the connection of the interface module 320 to a port....”) shows that the network interface listens on an network address to receive selected transmission of voice conference traffic from a second media processor.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Biage into the method of Whynot, where the network interface listens on an assigned network address to receive a selected transmission of voice conference traffic from a second media processor. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would want to clearly understand the language or words of other participants in a conference call.

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated and further Whynot does not disclose:

-the processor determines a net voice conference traffic result of no more than 'n' loudest voice channels from the selected portion of the incoming voice conference traffic and the selected transmission from the second media processor. However, Biage in an analogous art teaches the processor determines a net voice conference traffic result of no more than 'n' loudest voice channels from the selected portion of the incoming voice conference traffic and the selected transmission from the second media processor (Biage, page 3, [0030], lines 13-18, "The subtracting mechanism 328 subtracts from the total conference voice signal A+B+C the participant voice signal A to generate the net conference voice signal B+C.") and (Biage, page 5, [0038], lines 41-50, "Receiving a plurality of other voice signals 730.....Subtracting from the total conference signal the received voice signal to generate a net conference signal 750. Providing the net conference signal to the participant 760."), shows that a net voice conference traffic result was determined by the selected transmission from the second media processor.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Biage into the method of Whynot that the processor determines a net voice conference traffic result of no more than 'n' loudest voice channels from the selected portion of the incoming voice conference traffic and the selected transmission from the second media processor. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would want the method to perform a net voice conference analysis from the second media processor to clearly hear the second speaker.

As per claim 8, the rejection of claims 1 and 4 are incorporated and further Whynot discloses:

-a multicast buffer for storing a least a portion of the selected transmission (page 2, [0026], lines 11-14); where “one or more memories” is “multicast buffer” as claimed.

As per claim 13, rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and further Whynot does not disclose:

-the first media processor comprises a first network interface that receives incoming voice conference traffic, and a traffic filter that determines the selected data from the incoming voice conference traffic. However, Biage in analogous art discloses that the first media processor comprises a first network interface that receives incoming voice conference traffic, and a traffic filter that determines the selected data from the incoming voice conference traffic (Biage, page 2, [0013], lines 37-38, “for each of the interface modules the method comprising the steps of: a) receiving the signal from the participant”) and (Biage, page 3, [0030], lines 13-16, “The subtracting mechanism 328 subtracts from the total conference voice signal $A+B+C$ the participant voice signal A to generate the net conference voice signal $B+C$.”) shows that a first media processor comprises a first network interface that receives incoming voice traffic, and a traffic filter selects data, where participant voice signal A is the selected data, from the incoming traffic.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Biage into the method of Whynot, where the first media processor comprises a first network interface that receives incoming voice conference traffic, and a traffic filter that determines the selected data from the incoming voice

conference traffic. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would want to clearly understand the language or words of other participants in a conference call.

As per claim 16, the rejection of claims 9 and 15 are incorporated and further Whynot does not disclose:

-the first media processor determines a net voice conference traffic result of no more than 'n' loudest voice channels from the selected data and the selected transmission.

However, Biage in an analogous art discloses the first media processor determines a net voice conference traffic result of no more than 'n' loudest voice channels from the selected data and the selected transmission (Biage, page 3, [0030], lines 13-18, "The subtracting mechanism 328 subtracts from the total conference voice signal A+B+C the participant voice signal A to generate the net conference voice signal B+C. Subtracting of the participant voice signal results in the mitigation of the 'echo' effect in the net conference voice signal that is provided to the terminal (i.e. to the participant)").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Biage into the method of Whynot to state that the first media processor determines a net voice conference traffic result of no more than 'n' loudest voice channels from the selected data and the selected transmission. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would want to hear one speaker, or conferee, at a time.

Claim 19 recites similar a limitation as claim 13 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 13. The limitation in claim 19 states, "selecting

fewer than all voice channels..... as the selected portion”, which does not change the analysis of the limitation.

Claim 20 recites a similar limitation as claim 15 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 15. The limitation of claim 20 recites, “...receiving a selected transmission of voice conference traffic from a second media processor”, which does not change the analysis of the limitation.

As per claim 21, the rejection of claims 17, 19 and 20 are incorporated and further Whynot does not disclose:

-determining a net voice conference traffic result from the selected portion of the incoming voice conference traffic and the selected transmission from the second media processor. However, Biage in an analogous art discloses determining a net voice conference traffic result from the selected portion of the incoming voice conference traffic and the selected transmission from the second media (Biage, page 3, [0030], lines 13-16, “The subtracting mechanism 328 subtracts from the total conference voice signal A+B+C the participant voice signal A to generate the net conference voice signal B+C.”) shows determining a net voice conference traffic result from the selected portion of the incoming voice conference traffic and the selected transmission from the second media processor.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Biage into the method of Whynot, where determining a net voice conference traffic result from the selected portion of the incoming voice conference traffic and the selected transmission from the second media processor. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would want to reduce

errors or interference in voice conference information (Biage, page 3, [0030], lines 16-19, “Subtracting of the participant voice signal results in the mitigation of the ‘echo’ effect in the net conference voice signal that is provided to the terminal device (i.e. to the participant)”).

Claim 23 and 24 recite similar limitations as claim 21 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 21. The limitation in claim 23 states, “determining, at a second media processor, a second endpoint net traffic result from the selected portion and the second endpoint traffic”, which does not change the analysis of the limitation. Although claim 23 mentions “second media processor” and “second endpoint traffic”, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to perform the limitation in claim 23 in order to receive quality voice traffic. The limitation in claim 24 mentions “selecting fewer than all voice channels present in the selected portion....” which would be obvious to one skilled in the art in selecting a portion.

As per claim 29, the rejection of claim 27 is incorporated and further Whynot does not disclose:

-filtering the incoming voice conference traffic to obtain the selected portion.

However, Biage in an analogous art discloses filtering the incoming voice conference traffic to obtain the selected portion (Biage, page 3, [0030], lines 13-16, “The subtracting mechanism 328 subtracts from the total conference voice signal $A+B+C$ the participant voice signal A to generate the net conference voice signal $B+C$.”) shows filtering the incoming voice conference traffic to obtain the selected portion.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Baige into the method of Whynot, where filtering the incoming voice conference traffic to obtain the selected portion. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would want to reduce echoes in voice conference information (Biage, page 3, [0030], lines 16-19, "Subtracting of the participant voice signal results in the mitigation of the 'echo' effect in the net conference voice signal that is provided to the terminal device (i.e. to the participant)").

Claim 31 recites similar limitations as claim 21 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 21. The use of a machine readable medium does not change the analysis of the limitation.

10. Claims 2, 7, 12, 18, 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whynot (US Patent Publication No. 2004/0267882) and further in view of Mody (US Publication No. 2003/0206549).

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Whynot does not disclose:

-the network distribution address is a multicast address. However, Mody in an analogous art discloses the network distribution address is a multicast address (Mody, page 1, [0005] lines 55-56, "Third, the packets can be sent to a multicast address that comprises a specific group of users.") shows that the distribution of packets is performed by a multicast address.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Mody into the method of Whynot that the network distribution address is a multicast address. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would want to receive all of the packets without frequency errors (page 1, [0005] lines 49-50, "Multicasting of packets affords the most bandwidth efficient solution.")

As per claim 7, the rejection of claims 1 and 6 are incorporated and further Whynot does not disclose:

-the packets are User Datagram Protocol (UDP) packets. However, Mody in an analogous art discloses that the packets are User Datagram Protocol (UDP) packets (Mody, page 2, [0021], lines 15-18, "In this instance, the client opens a TCP connection or sends a UDP packet to the video server and requests retransmission of the missing packets") shows that packets are UDP packets.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Mody into the method of Whynot that the packets are User Datagram Protocol (UDP) packets. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would want to provide all of the necessary streaming information to the clients (page 2, [0021] lines 67-68 and lines 1-3, "In operation, a video stream or other information stream stored within the mass storage device as a plurality of packets including.....is transported to each of a plurality of clients.").

As per claim 12, rejection of claims 9 and 11 are incorporated and further Whynot does not disclose:

-the network distribution address is a User Datagram Protocol (UDP) multicast address. However, Mody in an analogous art discloses the network distribution address is a User Datagram Protocol (UDP) multicast address (Mody, page 1, [0006], lines 66-68, "During a multicast distribution each client 'listens' to the same UDP multicast address for incoming data.") shows that the network distribution address is a User Datagram Protocol (UDP) multicast address.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Mody into the method of Whynot that the network distribution address is a User Datagram Protocol (UDP) multicast address. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would want voice channels or information transmitted to other users in the group.

As per claim 18, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated and further Whynot does not disclose:

-transmitting comprises transmitting to a UDP multicast address. However, Mody in an analogous art transmitting comprises transmitting to a UDP multicast address (Mody, page 1, [0006], lines 66-68, "During a multicast distribution each client 'listens' to the same UDP multicast address for incoming data.") shows that information is transmitted to a UDP multicast address.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Mody into the method of Whynot that

transmitting comprises transmitting to a UDP multicast address. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would want voice channels or information transmitted to other users in the group.

As per claim 26, the rejection of claim 22 is incorporated and further Whynot does not disclose:

-distributing comprises transmitting to a multicast address. However Mody in an analogous art discloses distributing comprises transmitting to multicast address (Mody, page 1, [0005] lines 55-56, "Third, the packets can be sent to a multicast address that comprises a specific group of users.") shows that packets are transmitted to a multicast address.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Mody into the method of Whynot that distributing comprises transmitting to a multicast address. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would want to receive all of the packets that were transmitted (page 1, [0005] lines 46-48, ".....it is important to ensure that each of the clients receive all of the packets or datagrams transmitted thereto.")

Claim 28 recites a similar limitation as claim 26. The use of a machine readable medium does not change the analysis of the limitation. Therefore, claim 28 is rejected under the same reason set forth in the connection of the rejection of claim 26.

11. Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whynot (US Patent Publication No. 2004/0267882) and further in view of Schuster (U.S. Patent No. 6,125,343).

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Whynot does not disclose:

-the incoming voice conference traffic comprises voice channels, and further comprising a n-loudest channel filter that determines the selected portion as up to 'n' loudest of the voice channels. However, Schuster in an analogous art teaches the incoming voice conference traffic comprises voice channels, and further comprising a n-loudest channel filter that determines the selected portion as up to 'n' loudest of the voice channels (Schuster, column 2, lines 56-61, "As an alternative, the audio bridges in existing teleconferencing systems customarily select only the loudest incoming signal, or group of loudest incoming signals, to send to each of the conference participants. As an example, an audio bridge may decode all of the incoming bit streams and then measure the amplitudes of the PCM signals."), where an audio bridge decoding the incoming bit streams is performing channel filter.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Schuster into the method of Whynot to state that the incoming voice conference traffic comprises voice channels, and further comprising a n-loudest channel filter that determines the selected portion as up to 'n' loudest of the voice channels. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand what is being said, (Schuster, column 3, lines 6-8, "Additionally, each

participant will generally hear only the loudest of the speech signals and will therefore be able to more readily ascertain what is being conveyed”).)

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and further Whynot does not disclose:

-the distribution circuitry comprises a multicast switch. However, Schuster in an analogous art teaches the distribution circuitry comprises a multicast switch (Schuster, column 5, lines 37-39, “Existing audio bridges then re-encode the selected analog signal into a G.723.1 format and pass the re-encoded signal back to the participants as an output signal.”)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Schuster into the method of Whynot to state that the distribution circuitry comprises a multicast switch. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would to output or distribute the signal to the participants.

12. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whynot (US Patent Publication No. 2004/0267882), Biage (US Publication No. 2004/0190701) and further in view of Schuster (U.S. Patent No. 6,125,343).

As per claim 14, the rejection of claims 9 and 13 are incorporated and neither Whynot nor Biage discloses:

-the incoming voice conference traffic comprises voice channels and where the traffic filter is an n-loudest voice channel filter. However, Schuster in an analogous art teaches the incoming voice conference traffic comprises voice channels and where the traffic filter is an n-

loudest voice channel filter (Schuster, column 3, lines 15-17, “The bridge then re-encodes the selected loudest speech signal using G.723.1 and sends the encoded signal to all of the participants.”)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Schuster into the method of Whynot and Biage to state that the incoming voice conference traffic comprises voice channels and where the traffic filter is an n-loudest voice channel filter. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would want to use an analysis that would enable the loudest participant to be heard.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMAL J. KING whose telephone number is (571)270-3160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 6:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chameli Das can be reached on 571-272-3696. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 4141

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jamal King

Patent Examiner

Art Unit: 4141

December 10, 2007

/CHAMELI C. DAS/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4141

